

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP		Date
		13 MAY 1986
TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)		Initials Date
1.	DD/OIS	<i>[Signature]</i> 13 MAY 1986
2.	D/OIS	<i>[Signature]</i> 13 MAY 1986
3.		
4.		
5.		
Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Ben -

A chronically recurring problem. It is most appropriate that he attempt to do ~~something~~ something about it.

*[Signature]*

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

© US GPO: 1983-421-529/320

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)  
 Prescribed by GSA  
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

12 MAY 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: DO/IRO

STAT

FROM:

Information and Privacy Coordinator

STAT

SUBJECT: Sanitizing of Documents for Release Under FOIA

1. I have noticed recently an significant increase in the number of documents in which portions intended for redaction can be clearly read after copying. On Monday, 5 May, I personally identified three cases in which this problem was present; the attached, Lindsay, P86-0139, is an example. As is evident, the requester would be able to read everything which the FBI had bracketed for our review and which we had intended to redact. While both the assigned case officer and I personally review every sanitized document intended for release, I am concerned that sensitive information could nevertheless slip through our final review process.

2. As we all have experienced, such problems can arise from the color of the marking pen, the dryness of the pen, or the type of copier utilized. Because I have long been concerned that technical means or computer-enhancement techniques might permit someone to restore "blacked-out" information, we have formally requested OIS to review our present redaction process and our requirements and to recommend a procedure which would make the redaction process more certain. We will, of course, advise you of their findings.

3. In the interim, while it does not seem necessary for the IRO to re-review the documents after copying, it might be advisable to have someone at the supervisory level in the Processing Section check outgoing packages for read-through problems. I believe our joint efforts in this regard will significantly reduce the possibility of disclosure of sensitive information. If we can be of further assistance, please let me know.

STAT

IPD/  '8 July 1986

STAT

Orig - addr

Orig - addr

Orig - addr

1 - IPD Chrono

1 -  Signer

1 - D/OIS, DD/OIS

1 - OIS/LA

STAT

disk: IPD

id#: 512

**Page Denied**

Next 13 Page(s) In Document Denied